



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/624,918

07/22/2003

Hoo-min Toong

023.P017

7115

43831

7590

09/11/2008

BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LLP

17933 NW Evergreen Parkway, Suite 250

BEAVERTON, OR 97006

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,918

Applicant(s)

TOONG ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicants' amendment, filed 5 November 2007, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.
2. None of the claims are currently amended. Claims 1-40 remain pending in the application.

Priority

3. The examiner acknowledges the Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) to provisional U.S. Patent Application 60/397,542, filed 22 July 2002.
4. The examiner notes, however, that the provisional application is substantially more limited in its teaching than the instant application. At the least, the provisional application fails to disclose any aspect of analysis involving non-patent publications, association of times with data elements, and also fails to disclose any graphical display of the analysis results.

As a result, *at least* claims 4-10, 12, 13 and 15-17 are not entitled to the priority date of the provisional application, since the limitations claimed are not supported by the disclosure of the cited provisional application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. In view of the Applicants' arguments, as well as clarification from the Courts in the standards for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and from the Office in the examination guidelines with respect to patentable subject matter since the date of the last Office action, the pending claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are withdrawn.

6. Regarding claim 24 (and its dependent claims), this claim cites a processor program stored on a processor readable medium. In the absence of any modifying disclosure of this limitation in the specification, the examiner interprets the term 'processor readable medium' as excluding printed paper, transmission media, signals, or any form of energy, such that the claim clearly falls within a statutory class of invention as required under the terms of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-9, 11-16 and 18-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Rivette et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,339,767).

9. Regarding claim 1, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database of data elements as claimed, the method comprising:

a) based on a starting data element, identifying a first set of one or more data elements in the database, the data elements of the first set being referenced by the starting data element (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col.

87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87);

- b) based on the first set, identifying a second set of one or more data elements in the database, the data elements of the second set referencing one or more of the data elements of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87);

- c) generating data based on the data elements of the first and second sets and the relationships therebetween (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and
- d) the second set being identified by recursive searching, without user intervention, in which any successive search is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements (see disclosure that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

10. Regarding claim 11, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication as claimed, the method comprising:

- a) based on the starting patent publication, identifying a first set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the first set being cited by the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86);
- b) based on the first set, identifying a second set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the second set citing one or more of the publications of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col.

87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87);

c) generating data based on the publications of the first and second sets and the citation relationships therebetween (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and

d) the second set being identified by recursive searching, without user intervention, in which any successive search is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements (see disclosure that the patent citation report

can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

11. Regarding claim 24, **Rivette et al.** teaches a processor program for searching a database to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication as claimed, the processor program being stored on a processor readable medium and comprising instructions to cause the processor to:

- a) based on the starting patent publication, identify a first set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the first set being cited by the starting publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86);

- b) based on the first set, identify a second set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the second set citing one or more of the publications of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87);
- c) generate data based on the publications of the first and second sets and the relationship therebetween (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the

source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and

- d) wherein said instructions are further capable of causing the processor to identify the second set by recursive searching, without user intervention, in which any successive search is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements (see disclosure that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

12. Regarding claim 2, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying a first set of one or more data elements includes determining whether the starting data element includes one or more references to one or more other data elements and identifying a first set of one or more data elements based on the references (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent

[called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86).

13. Regarding claim 3, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying a second set of one or more data elements includes determining whether one or more data elements in the database include one or more references to one or more of the data elements of the first set and identifying a second set of one or more data elements based on the references (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87).

14. Regarding claim 4, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the starting data element is associated with a starting time and wherein identifying a first set of one or more data elements includes identifying data elements referenced by the starting data element and associated with first times earlier than the starting time (see

disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

15. Regarding claim 5, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying the second set of one or more data elements includes identifying data elements that reference the data elements of the first set and that are associated with second times later than the first times (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also

drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

16. Regarding claim 6, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying the second set of one or more data elements includes identifying data elements that reference the data elements of the first set and that are associated with second times later than the first times and earlier than the starting time (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

17. Regarding claims 7 and 14, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising providing the generated data to one or more of a user and a display (see drawing Figures 157-164).

18. Regarding claims 8 and 15, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising graphically displaying data elements of the first and second sets and the relationships therebetween (see drawing Figure 164).

19. Regarding claims 9 and 16, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the publications are represented by geometric shapes and wherein the relationships are represented by lines between geometric shapes (see drawing Figure 164).

20. Regarding claims 12 and 13, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the publications include one or more of patent publications and non-patent publications and wherein the patent publications include one or more of issued patents, published patent applications and non-published patent applications (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40).

21. Regarding claim 18, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising based on the second set, identifying one or more candidate patent publications for one or more of invalidating prior art for the starting patent publication, licensing opportunities and seminal prior art (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

22. Regarding claims 19 and 25, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for invalidating prior art includes identifying one or more patent publications in the second

set that do not cite the starting patent publication that are not cited by the starting patent publication and that are associated with filing dates earlier than the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

23. Regarding claims 20 and 26, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for licensing opportunities includes identifying one or more patent publications that are associated with a first assignee and that are cited by one or more patent publications associated with one or more different second assignees (see disclosure of the PatentRef

table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14, and specifically the disclosure of identification of potential licensees at col. 103, lines 37-58).

24. Regarding claims 21 and 27, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for seminal prior art includes identifying one or more patent publications that cite a first number of patent publications that cite a first number of patent publications and that are cited by a second number of patent publications, wherein the second number is greater than the first number (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through

col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

25. Regarding claims 22 and 28, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program further comprising based on the second set, identifying one or more co-citing patent publications, the co-citing patent publications including patent publications of the second set that are associated with one or more of filing dates later than the filing date of the starting patent publication and publication dates later than the filing date of the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53,

which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

26. Regarding claim 23, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising based on the co-citing patent publications, determining a patent prosecution strategy including one or more of filing one or more claims in a pending application, filing one or more continuing applications of a parent application, declaring one or more interferences and disclosing one or more of the co-citing patent publications to a patent-granting office (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure

87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

27. Regarding claims 29-40, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein said recursive searching, without user intervention, comprises using one or more queries generated by an application, generated primarily by an application, generated by an computing platform application and generated by a computer application (see Figure 86, disclosing that in step 8610, patents cited by each of the patents by reference to the PatentRef table are identified, the claimed application being anticipated by the disclosed patent citation module).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

30. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

31. Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rivette et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,339,767) as applied to claims 1-9, 11-16 and 18-40 above, and further in view of **Coleman et al.** ("Aesthetics-Based Graph Layout for Human Consumption").

32. Regarding claims 10 and 17, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database of data elements to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication substantially as claimed.

Rivette et al. does not explicitly teach a method further comprising determining locations at which to display the geometric shapes and lines to reduce overlaps between geometric shapes and crossings between lines.

Coleman et al., however, teaches a method further comprising determining locations at which to display the geometric shapes and lines to reduce overlaps between geometric shapes and crossings between lines (see disclosure of a number of common-sense rules for drawing aesthetically pleasing graphs, section 2.1 Layout Aesthetics, beginning on page 1417).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate rules for drawing aesthetically pleasing graphs, since this would result in a graph that maximized the measure of desirability, or aesthetic, in the resulting graph layout (see Summary, page 1415, et seq.).

Response to Arguments

33. Applicant's arguments filed 5 November 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
34. Regarding the Applicants' argument that the **Rivette et al.** reference fails to teach the claimed mechanism for recursive searching, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claim language at issue is as follows:

the second set being identified by recursive searching, without user intervention, in which any successive search is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements.

The Applicants' argument is summed up in third paragraph on page 18 of the Applicants' remarks:

Thus, the language of this claim encompasses much more than the Examiner has stated and much more than is shown in Rivette. This claim encompasses an innumerable number of recursive searches, in which any successive search, in comparison with the immediately preceding search, is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated elements, all of which occurs without any human intervention.

However, the examiner believes that limitations are being read into the language used in the claim.

For instance, the claim language clearly does not require that an infinite number of recursive searches be performed; it merely requires that any successive searches, if *executed*, be capable of either being contracted, expanded or modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements.

Furthermore, contrary to the Applicants' arguments, the placement of the 'without user interaction' clause indicates that it applies only to the identification of the

second set, but not necessarily to any successive searches which may or may not be executed.

The plain meaning of the claim language is that only a first set and a second set of data elements need be identified. The **Rivette et al.** reference anticipates these limitations, as detailed in the rejections of record.

Conclusion

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 571-272-4119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 571-273-4119, or sent via email at luke.wassum@uspto.gov, **with a previous written authorization in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 502.03. Such communications must be clearly marked as INFORMAL, DRAFT or UNOFFICIAL.**

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (571) 272-2100, or fax (571) 273-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



/Luke S. Wassum/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

lsw
9 September 2008